

**Amendments to the Drawing Figures:**

The attached drawing sheet includes proposed changes to FIGs. 3A and 3B and replaces the original sheet including FIGs. 3A and 3B.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claim 11 is newly added.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

The Office Action Summary indicates that the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner, but no further explanation is provided. The applicant respectfully requests clarification of this objection.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

New dependent claims are added to at least partially restore the original range of claims that existed before multiple dependencies were removed in the preliminary amendment. No new matter is added.

The Office action objects to FIGs. 3A and 3B; replacement drawings are correspondingly provided herein.

The Office action objects to the Specification, for use of the word "amongst". The applicant respectfully notes that "amongst" is a word in the English language, and a proper alternative to the word "among".

The Office action objects to the Specification; the specification is correspondingly amended herein. The applicant respectfully notes that "amongst" is a word in the English language, and therefore no correction is necessary.

The Office action rejects claims 1-2 and 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kim (USPA 2002/0036732), Hartung et al. (USP 5,859,625, hereinafter Hartung), and Lu et al. (USP 6,972,812, hereinafter Lu). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office action acknowledges that neither Kim nor Lu teach a liquid crystal device that is operable in an active mode and a standby mode, and relies on Hartung for this teaching.

Hartung fails to teach or suggest a driver that is configured to switch from the active mode to the standby mode by reducing only the maximum drive voltage that affects a bright state of the LCD only, as specifically claimed in claim 1, upon which each of the other claims depend.

Hartung teaches turning off a large number of lines of the display, thereby allocating more display time to each of the remaining lines (Hartung, column 7, lines 40-57). By reducing the number of active lines on the display, the number of different voltage levels required to provide optimal contrast can be reduced (Hartung, column 5, lines 2-7). As illustrated in Hartung's FIG. 5, however, the reduction in the number of different voltage levels reduces both the 'on'/bright voltage level and the 'off'/dark voltage level. In FIG. 3, the active state is illustrated as having an 'on' voltage level of  $7*V_d$ , and an 'off' voltage level of  $5*V_d$ . In FIG. 5, the standby state is illustrated as having an 'on' voltage level of  $3*V_d$ , and an 'off' voltage level of  $2*V_d$ . As noted above, Hartung teaches that this reduction of both the 'on' and 'off' voltage level to provide fewer voltage steps between the levels is selected to optimize the contrast ratio.

Because Hartung fails to teach or suggest a driver that is configured to switch from the active mode to the standby mode by reducing only the maximum drive voltage that affects a bright state of the LCD only, as specifically claimed in claim 1, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kim, Hartung, and Lu.

The Office action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kim, Hartung, Lu, and Adachi et al. (USPA 2004/0100598, hereinafter Adachi). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, based on the remarks above regarding Hartung and claim 1, upon which claim 3 depends. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kim, Hartung, Lu, and Adachi.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001